DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 465 EC 093 185

AUTHOR	Gottlieb, Jay
TITLE	Transitional Classes Program. School Year 1975-1976. Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[76]
NOTE	55p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Arithmetic; Elementary Secondary Education; *Emotionally Disturbed; *Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Reading Improvement; Reading Instruction

ABSTRACT

Described is the Transitional Classes Program for emotionally disturbed children 7-17 years old. It is explained that individual or small group sessions based on individualized programs are conducted daily to improve reading and math skills. Program evaluation findings are reported, including an improvement in six specified reading and six math objectives for students who participated for the entire year, and a mastery of nearly 100% of the instructional objectives students were taught. Appended are tables with student performance data from the Random House Criterion Reading Test and the American Guidance Associates Key Math Test. (CL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136465

EVALUATION REPORT

~~Function No. 09 69602~~

Transitional Classes Program

School Year 1975-1976

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Jay Gottlieb, Ph. D.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EC TM
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-1976 chool year.

EC093185

2

DR. ANTHONY J. POLEMENI, DIRECTOR

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

Table of Contents

Chapter		page
I.	The Program	1
II.	Evaluation Procedures	3
III.	Findings	5
IV.	Summary of major findings, conclusions and recommendations	14

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Percent of Pupils Passing Reading and Math Objectives in Relation to Amount of Time in Attendance	6
2.	Percentage of Pupils Demonstrating Mastery of Each Instructional Objective During Pretesting and Posttesting (Reading)	7
3.	Percentage of Pupils Demonstrating Mastery of Each Instructional Objective During Pretesting and Posttesting (Math).	8
B1.	Distribution of Pupil Mastery of Instructional Objectives Prior to Instruction (Reading)	9
B2.	Distribution of Pupil Mastery of Instructional Objectives Prior to Instruction (Math)	9
D1.	Distribution of Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered After Instruction (Reading)	10
D2.	Distribution of Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered After Instruction (Math)	10
C1.	Distribution of Pupil Mastery by Instructional Objectives as a Result of Instruction (Reading)	11
C2.	Distribution of Pupil Mastery by Instructional Objectives as a Result of Instruction (Math)	12
E1.	Distribution of Percentage of Pupils Achieving Various Levels of Mastery of Instructional Objectives (Reading)	13
E2.	Distribution of Percentage of Pupils Achieving Various Levels of Mastery of Instructional Objectives (Math)	13

Chapter I. The Program

The Transitional Classes Program provided supplementary instructional services to children who are enrolled in the tax-based program, "Special Classes for the Emotionally Handicapped." A total of 306 Title I eligible pupils passed through the register of the Transitional Classes Program during the 1975-1976 academic year. The age range of the pupils was approximately 7 to 17 years. The program was housed in nine sites, including two residential facilities for adolescent boys and girls.

The Transitional Classes Program provided remedial reading and math instruction to all children who participated in the "Special Classes for Emotionally Handicapped" program. At each site the Title I teacher and an aide worked with the children, usually in small groups of 2 or 3, to provide an intensive and closely articulated reading and math program with that provided by special class teachers. Each reading and/or math instructional session lasted approximately 30-45 minutes daily in a separate room that was contiguous with the special classrooms.

The actual instructional services that were provided to the pupils consisted of a number of aspects. First, diagnostic information was obtained for each pupil from a variety of sources, including past records and a work-up that was developed by each teacher. On the basis of the diagnostic information a written contract was structured for every pupil. The contract specified the daily activities for each pupil. The contracts also served as the basis for a token reinforcement system which was implemented by the teachers to serve two purposes: to improve pupils' behavior and to improve pupils' academic performance. In the token reinforcement system, points were awarded for the successful completion of a task as well as for appropriate behavior during the task.

The second major aspect of the instructional program consisted of the wide array of instructional materials that were employed to facilitate the pupils' learning experience. Many of the materials were made by the teachers and were used to supplement the commercially available materials. Detailed specimens of the pupils' work products were retained in their files and constituted an in-depth record of the children's growth during the year. These work specimens not only enable the teacher to plan more effective programs for the child, they also serve as important information on which to base an evaluation of each pupils' success which, when aggregated across all pupils, provides additional insights into the overall program effectiveness.

The third major aspect of the instructional program centers around the inputs of the supportive members of the professional team. Specifically, weekly meetings were held with psychologists, social workers, guidance counsellors, and/or psychiatrists who were familiar with the children. These sessions were especially relevant for case conferencing of pupils' who resided at a state hospital for emotionally disturbed children where the hospital personnel were more intimately acquainted with the out-of-school behavior of the pupils than were the public school teachers. Information gleaned from these weekly sessions was used to structure behavioral management objectives for pupils as well as instructional objectives and procedures for their implementation.

The Transitional Classes Program was supervised by the supervisor of the Division of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services Alternative Programs and the Acting Supervisor, Classes for the Emotionally Handicapped. In addition, one teacher-trainer was employed to assist the Title I teachers in developing individual reading and math remediation plans. The teacher trainer visited each school site approximately once every second week, although this schedule

varied depending on the particular needs of a site at a given time.

An additional aspect of the Title I program was the fact that the instructional remediation that was provided to the pupils enabled some of them to be mainstreamed into regular classes for a portion of the school day. When mainstreaming was done, the three teachers at each site, including the Title I teacher would consult with a receptive regular class teacher and the school principal about the child's academic and behavioral status and the possibilities that he could benefit from regular class placement. Although mainstreaming was not the primary function of the Title I program, the fact that it served to facilitate this process represented an educationally sound by-product.

Chapter II. Evaluative Procedures

As indicated in the evaluation design for the Transitional Classes Program, three evaluation objectives were set forth. These were:

1. To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, 70 percent of the pupils mastered at least six instructional objectives in both reading and mathematics which prior to the program they did not master.
2. To determine as a result of participation in the program the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives.
3. To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

The evaluative instruments employed to obtain data for the evaluation objectives included the Random House Criterion Reading Test and the American Guidance Associates Key Math Test. All pupils who participated in the Title I Transitional Classes Program were scheduled to be pretested and posttested.

As will be indicated in detail in the following chapter, there was one major limitation to the evaluation procedures and the accompanying statistical analyses. By definition, the population served by the Transitional Classes Program was transient. That is, the original conceptualization of the program was to provide a transitional educational program for seriously emotionally disturbed children. As a result, some children did not attend the program long enough to be pre- or posttested. Other children who were in attendance long enough to be tested were not in attendance long enough to be posttested, or else left the program abruptly without any advance notice to the staff. Still other children were enrolled in the program for a few months and there simply was not enough time to teach them the required six reading and six math objectives.. As will be indicated, some children attended the program for two months or less while others attended for the full academic year. Clearly the same standards for evaluation cannot be maintained for these two groups of children. Consequently, the data in the following section will be presented separately for children who attended the program for varying amounts of time. The evaluator, the program liason officer and the project director all agreed that such a presentation of data represented the most valid portrayal of the program's effectiveness.

Pretest data were collected at the time of the pupil's initial entry in the program. The number of children at the time of their entry were as follows:

September-October 172, November-December 58, January-February 43, March-April 33.

Of the 306 children who participated in this program, 35 were not tested because they enrolled for an insufficient amount of time. As an example, eight pupils as the Atlantic residential center were enrolled in the program for only one day.

Chapter III: Findings

Results for the Transitional Classes Program are summarized in accordance with the evaluation objectives. The first evaluation objective was to determine if, as a result of participation in the program, 70% of the pupils master at least six instructional objectives in both reading and math which prior to the program they did not master. According to the evaluation design, this objective was to be examined separately for each objective of instruction as per the SED classification system. A tabular presentation of these data appear on pages 7 and 8, for reading and math separately.

Although a perusal of the data on pages 7 and 8 will indicate that the pupils performed quite well on the objectives, the data can only be interpreted properly in relation to the following information. First, not all pupils were administered all instructional objectives. Consequently, the pretest mastery percentages are only for those children who were tested on the objective. Second, the posttest mastery percentages are best interpreted against a baseline of 97% mastery when aggregated across all instructional objectives. More simply put, 760 reading objectives were taught to 274 pupils. Of the 760 reading objectives, 736 were passed on posttesting. Similar data occurred for math.

A final word is in order regarding the number of instructional objectives (760) that were taught to the pupils during the school year. When we consider that the evaluation program required six reading and six math objectives to be achieved by each of the 306 pupils who passed through the program, then 1,836 reading and 1,836 math objectives should have been taught (306 X 6 for both reading and math). Obviously, this number of objectives was not taught. The reason for this is straightforward. Only 25% of the pupils attended the program for a full year which was defined as seven or more months participation. On the other hand, 33% of the pupils attended for two months or less. The problem of pupils' non-participation in the program was especially aggravated at the two residential facilities for adolescent boys and girls. At these centers, 144 children appeared

on the rosters, yet only 5 pupils attended for the entire year. In contrast, 67 pupils (47%) attended two months or less. Clearly, pupils who attended the program for two months or less were not going to be taught six reading and six math objectives. In point of fact, the 144 pupils in the two residential facilities were taught a total of 82 reading objectives and 302 math objectives. On a more positive note, these pupils failed only 3 reading and 2 math objectives on posttesting. Thus, the overall picture that emerges from these data is that children who participated in the program for an entire year did achieve the stated objectives of 70% passing in both reading and math. Equally obvious was the fact that those who participated less than one full year did not achieve these objectives. A more precise distribution of these data appear below, presented by two month intervals of attendance in the program.

Table 1

Percent of Pupils Passing Reading and Math Objectives in Relation to Amount of Time in Attendance

Months in program	Percent Passing Reading Posttest Six Objectives	Percent Passing Math Posttest Six Objectives
0-2	0%	0%
3-4	6	2
5-6	36	60
7-8	71	92

On the basis of these data, the evaluators concluded that the first evaluation objective was satisfactorally achieved.

The second evaluation objective was to determine the extent to which pupils

Percentage of Pupils Demonstrating Mastery of Each Instructional Objective During Pretesting and Posttesting

(Reading)

Objective	Pretest Mastery	Posttest Mastery	Objective	Pretest Mastery	Posttest Mastery
Letter recognition	55%	99%	Sentence structure	64%	92%
Initial consonants	61	95	Classifying	73	100
Final consonants	55	98	Inferences	81	100
Consonant blends	26	97	Facts and details	68	100
Vowels: single letters	46	100	Main ideas	72	100
Vowels: more than one letter	46	100	Picture clues	49	97
Compound words	88	100	Sequence	80	100
Contractions	80	100	Author's purpose	56	100
Endings	88	100			
Prefixes, suffixes	86	100			
Prepositions, phrases	89	100			

Percentage of Pupils Demonstrating Mastery of Each Instructional Objective During Pretesting and Posttesting

(Math)

Objective	Pretest Mastery	Posttest Mastery	Objective	Pretest Mastery	Posttest Mastery
Pre-operational concepts	52%	99%	Regions, planes	81%	96%
Fractions	63	100	Polygons	82	100
Decimals	93	100	English system	77	99
Addition	67	100	Temperature	91	100
Subtraction	74	100	Monetary system	82	100
Multiplication	73	100	Time and date	78	98
Division	88	98	Empty sets	78	100
Operations and relations	67	100	Analysis of problems	89	100
Numeration systems	89	100			
Estimation, rounding	80	100			

demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives. The analyses of this objective appear in Tables B through E, to conform to the tables that were specified in the evaluation design. Table A was not applicable to the present data since every pupil who did not master an objective on the pretest did have posttest data available.

The second phase of the second objective concerned the number of pupils who mastered the instructional objectives prior to instruction. Here, the data are presented in Table B1 and B2 to correspond to the reading and math objectives. Although it can been seen below in tables B1 and B2 that a substantial number of pupils (18%) achieved more than 75% of the objectives during pretesting, this number is somewhat inflated by the data from the two residential facilities where 30% of the children passed more than 75% of the objectives on pretest. Judging from a visual analysis of the Class Evaluation Record, the evaluator believes this was an artifact of the teachers' styles of test administration. Many children who passed a number of items had their test terminated as soon as they failed the first objective. Since many of these same children had very spotty attendance records, they never had the opportunity to complete additional test items; consequently there is a skewed distribution in relation to the number of items attempted and the number passed. The exact distributions appear below

Table B1

Distribution of Pupil Mastery of Instructional Objectives Prior to Instruction (Reading)

Percentage of Mastery	N	%
76%-100%	50	18
51 -75%	121	44
26 -50%	77	29
0 -25%	26	9

Table B2

Distribution of Pupil Mastery of Instructional Objectives Prior to Instruction (Math)

Percent Mastery	N	%
76-100%	56	20
51-75%	96	35
26 -50%	85	31
0 - 25%	37	14

Again, the reader should be aware of the number of artifacts that enter into this

analysis. For example, a pupil who was administered only one objective on pretesting could have received a score of 0% or 100% simply on the basis of his response to a single item. In the evaluator's judgment, a more appropriate statistical analysis would have been to covary the number of pretest items to which a child responded.

Another way to examine the data from the Transitional Classes Program is to study the distribution of mastery by instructional objective as a result of instruction. These data, which appear in Tables C1 and C2, are somewhat similar to the data which were presented in Tables 2 and 3, except that it provides the additional data regarding the raw frequencies representing the ratio of pupils achieving mastery relative to the number of pupils who attempted mastery. The relevant data for these Tables appear on pages 11 and 12.

The reader will immediately notice that only 181 pupils are listed as passing between 0 and 12 objectives on reading objectives. This figure, which must be considered in relation to the 271 who actually were present for testing, is depressed by 90. The 90 pupils do not appear on the table because they never were administered any reading objectives for test purposes, consequently they could not demonstrate mastery. 88 of the 90 pupils who were not administered reading objectives attended one of the two residential facilities for adolescent pupils. The remaining two attended elementary of junior high schools.

Table D1

Distribution of Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered After Instruction (Reading)

Number mastered	# pupils	% pupils
None	10	6%
1-2	54	30
3-4	40	22
5-6	53	29
7-8	16	9
9-10	7	4
11-12	1	0

Table D2

Distribution of Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered After Instruction (Math)

Number Mastered	# pupils	% pupils
None	8	3%
1-2	90	35
3-4	58	23
5-6	40	16
7-8	39	15
9-10	10	4
11-12	10	4

Table C1

Distribution of Pupil Mastery by Instructional Objectives as a Result of Instruction (Reading)

Objective	Ration of # pupils achieving mastery / # pupils attempting mastery	Percent of Mastery
Letter recognition	118/119	99%
Initial consonants	41/43	98
Final consonants	44/45	98
Consonant blends	38/39	97
Vowels: Single letters	43/43	100
Vowels: More than one letter	38/38	100
Compound words	6/6	100
Contractions	1/1	100
Endings	4/4	100
Prefixes, suffixes	7/7	100
Prepositions, phrases	4/4	100
Sentence structure	22/24	98
Classifying	10/10	100
Inferences, cause effect	9/9	100
Facts and details	9/9	100
Main ideas	9/9	100
Picture clues	34/35	99
Sequence	7/7	100
Author's sequence	3/3	100

Table C2

Distribution of Pupil Mastery by Instructional Objectives as a Result of Instruction

(Math)

Objective	Ratio of # pupils achieving Mastery / # pupils attempting Mastery	Percent of Mastery
Pre-operational concepts	113/115	98%
Fractions	51/51	100
Decimals	9/9	100
Addition: Concepts and skills	71/71	100
Subtraction	45/45	100
Multiplication	42/42	100
Division	27/29	93
Operations and relations	55/55	100
Numeration systems	12/12	100
Estimation, rounding	25/25	100
Regions, planes	9/11	82
Polygons	15/15	100
English system	18/19	95
Temperature	4/4	100
Monetary system	12/12	100
Time and date	10/11	91
Empty sets	15/15	100
Analysis of problems	2/2	100

The final tabular presentation of the data appear in tables E1 and E2 in which the distribution of percentage of pupils achieving various levels of mastery are presented. It is immediately apparent that virtually all pupils who attempted objectives, achieved them. Recall that only 24 reading and eight math objectives were not successfully achieved. Also, a single pupil failed more than two instructional objectives, with the remainder failing two or less. The precise data appear below. Notice that the children who scored 0-10% were the ones who were taught less than three objectives.

Table E1

Distribution of Percentage of Pupils Achieving Various Levels of Mastery of Instructional Objectives (Reading)

Percent Mastery	N	% pupils
90-100%	160	94%
80-90	6	3
10-20	1	0
0-10	4	3

Table E2

Distribution of Percentage of Pupils Achieving Various Levels of Mastery of Instructional Objectives (Math)

Percent Mastery	N	% pupils
90-100%	249	99
80-90	3	.5
0-10	3	.5

The third and final evaluation objective was to determine the extent to which the program objectives were actually carried out. On the basis of site visits to the various sites where the program was delivered, the evaluator can safely conclude that the program was carried out exactly as it was indicated in the proposal. This is hardly surprising since this program has been in operation for several years and has been administered by the same personnel throughout the life of the program. Also, there has been great consistency in the teaching staff. Every item stipulated in the proposal was executed. As examples, small group instruction was conducted, token reinforcement systems were adopted very successfully. Materials were available throughout the year. The teacher-trainer conducted her training sessions. Weekly clinical meetings were held. Furthermore, when one considers that the population of children served by this program is seriously disturbed, the fact that relatively few behavior problems occurred at the end of the year is testimonial to the achievement of the teaching staff.

An additional concern to this evaluation was the extent to which recommendations from the previous year's evaluations were implemented. Since most of the prior year's recommendations required additional expenditures they were not implemented in this program. For example, an additional teacher trainer was not hired. Instead, the program operated with one teacher trainer. Similarly, an additional counsellor was not hired. However, some of the centers did have available to them personnel who were able to provide consulting assistance in behavior management techniques, per the previous evaluator's recommendation.

Finally, the present evaluator did not detect any discrepancies, much less serious discrepancies, from the proposed activities specified in the proposal. The one difficulty that did occur, but which was not directly stated in the proposal, concerns the testing itself. Approximately 12% of the total time during the school year was devoted to testing pupils, according to the teachers. In the evaluator's judgment, this is an exceptionally high percentage of time since it reduces the time spent on remediation activities.

Chapter IV. Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Basically, the program achieved the objective of having 70% of the pupils master 6 reading and 6 math objectives. This was achieved by the pupils who attended for a full year. Those pupils who attended less than the full year, achieved correspondingly fewer objectives.

The evaluator's recommendations are as follows:

1. The program is excellent and should be continued. The reasons for this recommendation are simple. A population of seriously disturbed children is receiving academic assistance from which it is benefitting. In addition,

the children are receiving the socializing experiences of a structured educational program. Both of these experiences are crucial to the pupils' development.

2. Testing should be reduced in time, if possible. As was previously stated, the testing portion of the program consumed approximately 12% of the total school time. This is an extremely large part of the program and could probably be reduced. Six reading and six math objectives may be too many to require of this population of children.

3. The number of objectives to be achieved by the pupils should be proportional to the number of months the pupils attend the program. Since this program serves a transient population, children who attend for less than a full year should be required to master fewer objectives.

4. An additional teacher trainer should be hired. This would greatly facilitate achieving the program's goals. The one teacher trainer who was available this year performed very well. However, it was difficult for her to visit all nine sites at a moment's notice, especially since the sites were spread over the entire city.

In sum, this is an excellent program.

TRANSITIONAL CLASSES PROGRAM

ABSTRACT

Function No.09-69602

The Transitional Classes Program is designed for emotionally disturbed youngsters between the ages of approximately 7 and 17 years. The program focuses on improving reading and math skills by providing the pupils with daily instructional sessions lasting approximately 30 to 45 minutes. Children are taught either individually or in groups of 2 or 3. Each child has an individualized program tailored to his needs, and a writeen contract is kept which specifies the daily activities that each pupil is expected to achieve. A token reinforcement system is employed whereby children are rewarded with points for successful performance on their assigned tasks.

This program is remarkably successful in improving the academic skills of a population of seriously disturbed youngsters. Children who participated in the program for the entire year improved in six reading and six math objectives. However, many children attended for a very brief period of time and their achievement gains were somewhat lower. The post-instruction performance of the children in both reading and math indicated that they mastered almost 100% of the instructional objectives that they were taught. Of course, there was variability here and not all objectives were mastered at a 100% level of proficiency.

The success of this program can be attributed to a number of factors, including the ongoing leadership provided over the years by the program's administrators, the close working relationship maintained between the Title I teachers and the tax levy teachers, and the weekly clinical sessions in which the problems of the children are discussed and ways to overcome these problems are suggested and implemented.

Overall, this is a very effective program that accomplishes a great deal for children in serious academic need.

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION II

1975-76 School Year

Due Date: July 1, 1976

SED Project Number: | 3 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | 7 | 6 | | 0 | 0 | 2 | | | |

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only); | 0 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 2 |

Project Title Transitional Classes Program

School District Name D.S.E.P.P.S., District 75

School District Address 110 Livingston St.
Brooklyn, N. Y. 11201

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Jay Gottlieb, Ph.D.

Title Consultant-Evaluator

Telephone Number 703 (Area Code) 525-0312

Date this form was completed 9/ 1 / 76 .

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2)	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	Passing	Failing
6 0 8 1 3 5 1	2 1 0 1	Random House	1	0	10	10	0
"	2 1 0 1	"	2	5	6	6	0
"	2 1 0 2	"	"	7	6	6	0
"	2 1 0 4	"	"	10	2	2	0
"	2 2 0 1	"	"	9	1	1	0
"	2 2 0 3	"	"	10	1	1	0
"	2 2 0 4	"	"	11	2	2	0
"	2 2 0 7	"	"	10	1	1	0
"	2 4 0 3	"	"	11	1	1	0
"	2 4 0 7	"	"	10	4	4	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 1 3 5 1	2 1 0 1	Random House	3	8	5	5	0
"	2 1 0 2	"	"	10	5	5	0
"	2 1 0 6	"	"	12	3	3	0
"	2 1 0 8	"	"	13	1	1	0

- 12 -

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	8	1	4	5	1	2	1	0	1	Random House	2	6	5	5	0
			"				2	1	0	2	"	"	7	6	6	0
			"				2	1	0	4	"	"	9	4	4	0
			"				2	2	0	1	"	"	9	2	2	0
			"				2	2	0	3	"	"	6	2	2	0
			"				2	2	0	4	"	"	9	2	2	0
			"				2	2	0	7	"	"	9	7	6	1
			"				2	4	0	2	"	"	9	2	2	0
			"				2	4	0	3	"	"	11	2	1	0
			"				2	4	0	4	"	"	11	1	1	0
			"				2	4	0	6	"	"	8	4	4	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6	0	8	1	4	5	1	2	4	0	7	Random House	2	8	6	5	1
			"				2	4	0	8	"	"	9	4	4	0
			"				2	4	1	1	"	"	7	1	1	0
			"				2	1	0	1	"	3	12	18	17	1
			"				2	1	0	2	"	"	16	8	7	1
			"				2	1	0	4	"	"	17	8	7	1
			"				2	1	0	5	"	"	5	15	14	1
			"				2	1	0	6	"	"	4	18	18	0
			"				2	1	0	7	"	"	9	16	16	0
			"				2	1	0	8	"	"	9	17	15	2
			"				2	1	0	9	"	"	3	3	3	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	8	1	4	5	1	2	2	0	1	Random House	3	8	1	1	0
			"				2	2	0	6	"	"	10	2	2	0
			"				2	2	0	7	"	"	6	9	9	0
			"				2	4	0	2	"	"	5	2	2	0
			"				2	4	0	3	"	"	9	3	3	0
			"				2	4	0	4	"	"	5	2	2	0
			"				2	4	0	6	"	"	8	3	3	0
			"				2	4	0	7	"	"	3	9	9	0
			"				2	4	0	9	"	"	7	6	6	0
6	0	8	1	4	5	1	2	1	0	6	"	4	8	2	2	0
			"				2	1	0	7	"	"	10	2	2	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
													No. of Pupils		No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	8	1	4	5	1	2	1	0	8	Random House	4	7	3	3	0
			"				2	2	0	7	"	"	8	1	1	0
			"				2	4	0	2	"	"	4	2	2	0
			"				2	4	0	6	"	5	5	1	1	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
60815511	2101	Random House	2	10	2	2	0
"	2102	"	"	10	2	2	0
"	2104	"	"	10	4	4	0
"	2201	"	"	12	1	1	0
"	2203	"	"	12	1	1	0
"	2204	"	"	14	1	1	0
"	2206	"	"	13	1	1	0
"	2403	"	"	13	1	1	0
"	2407	"	"	9	4	4	0
"	2408	"	"	14	1	1	0
"	2411	"	"	14	1	1	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 1 5 5 1	2 1 0 1	Random House	3	25	7	7	0
"	2 1 0 2	"	"	16	16	15	1
"	2 1 0 4	"	"	10	27	26	1
"	2 1 0 5	"	"	9	24	24	0
"	2 1 0 6	"	"	7	16	16	0
"	2 1 0 7	"	"	8	17	17	0
"	2 1 0 8	"	"	8	25	24	1
"	2 1 0 9	"	"	10	5	5	0
"	2 2 0 1	"	"	7	1	1	0
"	2 2 0 2	"	"	4	1	1	0
"	2 2 0 4	"	"	8	2	2	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 1 5 5 1	2 2 0 6	Random House	3	8	1	1	0
"	2 2 0 7	"	"	10	6	5	1
"	2 4 0 2	"	"	9	3	3	0
"	2 4 0 3	"	"	6	3	3	0
"	2 4 0 4	"	"	3	6	6	0
"	2 4 0 6	"	"	3	1	1	0
"	2 4 0 7	"	"	4	12	12	0
"	2 4 0 8	"	"	1	1	1	0
"	2 4 0 9	"	"	2	1	1	0
"	2 4 1 1	"	"	2	1	1	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 1 5 5 1	2 1 0 6	Random House	4	5	4	4	0
"	2 1 0 7	"	"	6	3	3	0
"	2 1 0 8	"	"	2	4	3	1
"	2 4 0 2	"	"	0	1	1	0

- 10 -

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6	0	9	1	3	5	1	1	1	0	1	American Guidance		2	23	23	0
6	0	9	1	3	5	1	1	1	0	3	"		19	6	6	0
6	0	9	1	3	5	1	1	1	0	4	"		11	0	0	0
6	0	9	1	3	5	1	1	1	0	7	"		20	5	5	0
6	0	9	1	3	5	1	1	1	0	8	"		19	2	2	0
6	0	9	1	3	5	1	1	1	0	9	"		14	0	0	0
6	0	9	1	3	5	1	1	1	1	0	"		17	0	0	0
6	0	9	1	3	5	1	1	1	1	1	"		17	0	0	0
6	0	9	1	3	5	1	1	1	1	2	"		22	3	3	0
6	0	9	1	3	5	1	1	1	1	3	"		15	1	1	0
6	0	9	1	3	5	1	1	1	1	5	"		9	0	0	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 9 1 3 5 1	1 2 0 3	American Guidance		11	0	0	0
"	1 2 0 5	"		15	2	2	0
"	1 3 0 2	"		9	2	2	0
"	1 3 0 4	"		10	0	0	0
"	1 3 0 5	"		15	1	1	0
"	1 3 0 6	"		10	1	0	1
"	1 6 0 2	"		17	9	9	0
"	1 9 0 1	"		3	0	0	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6 0 9 1 4 5 1	1 1 0 1	American Guidance		21	25	25	0
"	1 1 0 3	"		17	27	27	0
"	1 1 0 4	"		18	2	2	0
"	1 1 0 7	"		15	25	25	0
"	1 1 0 8	"		11	17	17	0
"	1 1 0 9	"		9	16	16	0
"	1 1 1 0	"		13	12	12	0
"	1 1 1 1	"		16	20	20	0
"	1 1 1 2	"		16	20	20	0
"	1 1 1 3	"		18	7	7	0
"	1 1 1 5	"		10	10	10	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 9 1 4 5 1	1 2 0 3	American Guidance		8	4	3	1
"	1 2 0 5	"		24	3	3	0
"	1 3 0 2	"		26	9	9	0
"	1 3 0 4	"		11	2	2	0
"	1 3 0 5	"		14	6	6	0
"	1 3 0 6	"		10	7	7	0
"	1 6 0 2	"		16	3	3	0
"	1 9 0 1	"		8	1	1	0

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)		
6	0	9	1	5	5	1	1	1	0	1	American Guidance		90	57	55	2
			"				1	1	0	3	"		151	18	18	0
			"				1	1	0	4	"		87	7	7	0
			"				1	1	0	7	"		110	41	41	0
			"				1	1	0	8	"		100	26	26	0
			"				1	1	0	9	"		90	26	26	0
			"				1	1	1	0	"		83	17	15	2
			"				1	1	1	1	"		80	35	35	0
			"				1	1	1	2	"		62	2	2	0
			"				1	1	1	3	"		49	8	8	0
			"				1	1	1	5	"		80	15	13	2

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code							Instructional Mastery Code				Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
													Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6	0	9	1	5	5	1	1	2	0	3	American Guidance		27	7	6	1
			"				1	2	0	5	"		31	10	10	0
			"				1	3	0	2	"		29	8	7	1
			"				1	3	0	4	"		18	2	2	0
			"				1	3	0	5	"		27	5	5	0
			"				1	3	0	6	"		19	3	3	0
			"				1	6	0	2	"		20	3	3	0
			"				1	9	0	1	"		5	1	1	0

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to MIR, item #30) Function # 09-69602

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	
						N	%		Number/ Reason
6 0 8 1 4	7 2 0		Random House	60	58	2	3%	children were untestable	
6 0 8 1 5	7 2 0		"	202	172	30	15%	7 pupils were absent without leave; 8 were untestable, and the remaining 15 were not in the program long enough to be tested.	
6 0 9 1 4	7 2 0		Key Math	60	58	2	3%	children were untestable	
6 0 9 1 5	7 2 0		"	202	172	30	15%	7 pupils were absebt without leavel 8 were untestable, and the remaining 15 were not in the program long enough to be tested	

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item#30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item#30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.